REMARKS

The Applicant has received and reviewed the Final Official Action mailed by the Office on 5 July 2005 (hereinafter, the "Final Action"), and submits the paper as a fully-responsive reply thereto. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections lodged against the subject application. Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-17, and 21-23 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

As stated on page 2 of the Final Action, Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-17, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a publication titled, "LASS: Putting the telephone customer in charge", by C. Brant Hirschman, Grant E. Swinehart, and Marie L. Todd, dated May 1985 (hereinafter, "Hirschman"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,436,957 to McConnell (hereinafter, "McConnell"), and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,206,900 to Callele (hereinafter, "Callele"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 defines a method for blocking future calls from the caller to the callee, and recites (with emphasis added here for convenience):

> "connecting a call from the caller to the callee;
>
> receiving a first instruction from the callee to access a service to block future calls from the caller to the callee;
>
> *providing at least one callee selection* via a voice prompt responsive to the first instruction;
>
> *receiving a second instruction from the callee*;
>
> identifying a first telephone number associated with the caller;

storing the first telephone number associated with the caller in a caller block table in a service data point (SDP); and

preventing, via a service switching point (SSP), one or more phone calls from the first telephone number from being forwarded to a second telephone number associated with the callee."

The combination of Hirschman, McConnell, and Callele fails to teach or suggest this method. The Applicant agrees with the assessment on Page 4 of the Final Action that Hirschman does not teach providing at least one callee selection via a voice prompt responsive to the first instruction, and receiving a second instruction from the callee. Therefore, the Office cited column 4, lines 13-16 and 22-24 of Callele for this teaching. However, the Applicant submits that this portion of Callele does not provide the teaching missing from Hirschman necessary to support a § 103 rejection of claim 1. More particularly, the Applicant submits that Callele does not teach or suggest at least the features emphasized above as recited in claim 1.

For convenience, the Applicant reproduces the cited portion of Callele below:

signals in order to take advantage of the coded ring signalling (commonly known as "Distinctive Ringing") available from the LECs (Local Exchange Carriers).

The FSK (Frequency Shift Key) demodulator 43 converts the FSK ICLID transmission to a TTL level bit stream and forwards it to the microprocessor 42. The microprocessor then stores this information in RAM 49 or on DISK 50. The microprocessor 42 can then use the ICLID transmission as an index into a database stored in RAM 49 or on DISK 50. This database can contain information such as the name associated with the number (or vice versa), the security clearance, etc. Once the database search has been completed, the microprocessor 42 can decide whether to not answer the call, to give a confirmation tone, or to answer the incoming call.

The microprocessor 42 uses software stored in ROM 48, RAM 49, or on secondary storage such as DISK 50 to determine how to answer the incoming call. As illustrated, a number of options are available. The microprocessor 42 directs the line interface 40 to go to the off hook state. The microprocessor 42 can then instruct the voice synthesizer 54 to place voice prompts on the telephone line. In response to these voice prompts the calling party may enter DTMF or Dial Pulse signals, FAX signals, MODEM signals, or attempt to leave a voice message. These responses can be received and interpreted by the microprocessor via one or more of the DTMF/Dial Pulse decoder 44, the FAX modem 45, the modem 46, or the voice digitizer 47.

Information about received calls is forwarded under

Turning to Callele in detail, column 4, lines 13-16 appear to describe a database and related searching, and thus do not appear to teach or suggest "*providing at least one callee selection* via a voice prompt responsive to the first instruction;", or "*receiving a second instruction from the callee*". Column 4, lines 22-24 appear to describe a microprocessor placing voice prompts on a telephone line. Column 4, line 25 describes a "calling party" entering DTMF or Dial Pulse signals, or other types of signals. In contrast, the Applicant's claim 1 as emphasized above recites "receiving a second instruction *from the callee*". Accordingly, Callele

neither teaches nor suggests at least this feature as recited in claim 1, and thus does not support a § 103 rejection of claim 1. On at least this basis, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1.

Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend from claim 1 and are allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. Additionally, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 1, define methods not taught or suggested by the Hirschman/McConnell/ Callele combination.

Claim 13 recites the above features similarly to claim 1 and hence benefits from the argument directed above to claim 1. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 13.

Claims 14-17 depend from claim 13 and are allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. Additionally, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 13, define telecommunications systems not taught or suggested by the Hirschman/McConnell/ Callele combination.

Claim 21 recites the above features similarly to claim 1 and hence benefits from the argument directed above to claim 1. The Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the § 103 rejection of claim 21.

Claims 22-23 depend from claim 21 and are allowable over the cited combination by virtue of this dependency. Additionally, these claims recite features that, when taken together with those of claim 21, define methods not taught or suggested by the Hirschman/McConnell/ Callele combination are added for consideration.

Conclusion

Claims 1-5, 7-10, 13-17, and 21-23 are in condition for allowance over the cited art. The Applicant respectfully requests favorable action on the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, **the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6 SEPT 05

By: _____

Rocco L. Adornato
Lee & Hayes, pllc
Reg. No. 40,480
(509) 324-9256 ext. 257